IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3

TESSERA, INC., 4

5

1

2

6

8

11

13

LTD.,

14

15

16

19

22

21

23 24

25

26 27 l

Plaintiff,

v.

ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC.; SPANSION, LLC; SPANSION, INC; SPANSION TECHNOLOGY, INC.; ADVANCED SEMICONDUCTOR ENGINEERING, INC.; ASE (U.S.), INC.; CHIPMOS TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; CHIPMOS U.S.A., INC.; SILICONWARE PRECISION INDUSTRIES CO., LTD.; SILICONWARE USA, INC.; STMICROELECTRONICS N.V.; STMICROELECTRONICS, INC.; STATS CHIPPAC, INC.; STATS CHIPPAC (BVI), LTD.; and STATS CHIPPAC,

No. C 05-4063 CW

ORDER GRANTING THE ASE DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO ADOPT THE SPECIAL MASTER'S JUNE 19, 2013 ORAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION (Docket Nos. 1200, 1202 and 1203)

Defendants.

AND ALL RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS

Defendants Advanced Semiconductor Engineering, Inc. and ASE (U.S.), Inc. (ASE Defendants) request that the Court adopt the June 19, 2013 oral report and recommendation made by the Special 20 Master to resolve the ASE Defendants' motion to enforce their agreement with Plaintiff Tessera, Inc. that Tessera's infringement and damages expert reports were due by May 15, 2013. Tessera opposes the motion. The parties also dispute the standard that the Court should utilize to review the Special Master's report and recommendation.

Having considered the papers filed by the parties, the Court grants ASE's motion and adopts the Special Master's report and recommendation, under either the de novo or abuse of discretion

3

11

14 II

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

standard, for the reasons set forth by the Special Master orally at the hearing. The parties agreed, first in the March 22, 2013 email exchange and then again in the March 28, 2013 email exchange, that Tessera's expert reports on infringement and damages with respect to the ASE Defendants would be due on May 15, 2013. Tessera has not shown that it had substantial justification to serve supplemental expert reports on May 31, 2013, on the basis that the ASE Defendants did not complete their production of die thickness information until April 8, 2013; Tessera knew, at the time of the March 28, 2013 affirmation, that it would not receive this production until April 8, 2013 and cannot now complain that the agreed-upon schedule left it with insufficient time. Further, Tessera has not shown that the delay would not prejudice the ASE Defendants.

Accordingly, as recommended by the Special Master, the Court orders that Tessera may not rely on the expert reports of Professors Fan, Han, Sullivan, or Start served on May 31, 2013 with respect to any infringement or damages claim against ASE. The Court denies ASE's request for attorneys' fees and costs incurred in connection with comparing the original reports to the supplemental reports and in bringing the motion to enforce the agreement.

The motion and stipulation to shorten time are denied as moot. This Order resolves Docket Nos. 1200, 1202 and 1203.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 7/19/2013

United States District Judge